

**REMARKS**

Rejection of claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over RFC 3220- IP Mobility Support for IPv4 (Perkins) in view of US 2002/0126642 (Shitama)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-22. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Perkins and Shitama does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claims 1, 12, and 13. For example, independent claims 1, 12, and 13 recite “a registration request message . . . that includes a request to allocate [] at least one mobile network prefix to said mobile router” and “a registration reply . . . that includes [] at least one allocated mobile network prefix” (emphasis added), which is not taught or suggested in the combination of Perkins and Shitama.

Perkins does teach a Registration Request and Registration Reply exchange, as stated in the Office Action. However, the Registration Request and Registration Reply exchange is to update a mobile node’s home agent as to the current location (e.g., care-of-address) of the mobile node so that datagrams can reach the mobile node when it is away from its home network. For example, at page 27, Perkins states that the Registration Request and Registration Reply exchange “provides a flexible mechanism for mobile nodes to communicate their current reachability information to their home agent. It is the method by which mobile nodes: -request forwarding services [of datagrams] when visiting a foreign network, -inform their home agent of their current care-of address, -renew a registration which is due to expire, and/or -deregister when they return home. . . Registration creates or modifies a mobility binding at the home agent, associating the mobile node’s home address with its care-of address for the specified Lifetime”, wherein a care-of address is the termination point of a tunnel toward the mobile node for datagrams forwarded to the mobile node when the mobile node is away from home, (see page 6 of Perkins). Applicant has searched the Perkins reference and could not find a teaching that the Registration Request “includes a request to allocate [] at least one mobile network prefix to said mobile router” or that the Registration Reply “includes [] at least one allocated mobile network prefix”. Applicant has also failed to find these limitations taught in Shitama.

Therefore, since the combination of Perkins and Shitama fails to disclose Applicant’s claimed invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 12, and 13, Applicant respectfully

requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 12, and 13 under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant requests that claims 1, 12, and 13 now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 2-11 and 14-22 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 13. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 2-11 and 14-22 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims. Applicant requests that claims 2-11 and 14-22 may now be passed to allowance.

### Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

### SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
1303 East Algonquin Road  
IL01/3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Schaumburg, IL 60196  
Customer Number: 22917

By: /Valerie M. Davis/  
Valerie M. Davis  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 50,203  
  
Telephone: 847-576-6733  
Fax No.: 847-576-0721  
Email: [vdavis@motorola.com](mailto:vdavis@motorola.com)